



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,592	04/06/2001	Simon J.E. Walker	DHN/314/US	6885

7590 09/08/2003  
Alix, Yale & Ristas  
750 Main Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-2721

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/827592

Applicant(s)

Examiner

N. Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

## Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

PTO-1449, the listed W0 document has not been supplied.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claim 20 "second connector part" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application.

Spec page 1, a paragraph for the US provisional paragraph is required.

For claims 16, 17, 18, should the "installation" be set forth as being "electrically conductive" the recited "electrically isolating" feature is ineffective unless the installation (panel) is conductive. Applicant is asked to discuss this issue.

Abstract, line 11 after "flexible" --(elastomeric)-- after "portion", --(4, 20) and at end--  
The flexible portion (4) may include apertures (10) for receiving bolts for panel mounting. Rigid inserts (12) may be included in the apertures. --should be added with numeral use suggested.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2839

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIA (pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 15-19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nieman.

The Nieman assembly see fig. 4 includes a connector part 31 (or 36) a flexible parts 29, 47 and is to be mounted to a panel (installation). Use in severe environment defines no structural limitation over Nieman.

Art Unit: 2839

For claims 2, 4-10, note first component 34 or 31, second component 27 or 47 and third component 27 or 21 and mounting holes 23. Claims 3, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20 also met by Nieman arrangement of parts. For claims 16, 17, 18, the parts 29, 47, are seen to provide electrical isolation of shell 31 from housing 21. Note the claims only require that parts 24 or 47 provide ~~that there be~~ isolation, not full isolation of the connector part 31 or 36.

Claims 1-12, 15-19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nieman in view of Kameyama.

For claim 1, should the severe environment term be at issue, Kameyama is noted to disclose connector use in engine compartments at high temperature. Obvious to similarly use Nieman, this being a standard use for such connectors.

Claims 1, 16, 18, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kameyama.

Kameyama assembly, fig. 2, includes connects 1 with a flexible (isolating) portion 5 for fitting in installation P. The portion 5 is also secured to panel P by fitting into slots 7a, 7b.

Kameyama fig. 1, assembly includes connector part 20 and an isolating apparatus 15, 14 secured at a radially inner part to 20 and at a radially outer part to panel P. For claims 2, 4, Kameyama, fig. 1, apparatus readable as having an inner frame component and outer components formed by rings 14.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama.

Art Unit: 2839

For claim 15, Kameyama fig. 1 assembly is applied but lacks axially offset portions. These are shown in fig. 2 at 2. Obvious to apply such portions to the fig. 1 inner frame part 15. These will act to enable the apparatus to better absorb stress, col. 5, lines 10-25.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mosquera.

The Mosquera insulative apparatus 12 is to be secured at a radially inner part 38, 40, etc to connector 14 and is to be secured at a radially outer part at leadlines 50, 42 to an installation.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Daoud and Waskiewicz.

Inoue fig. 13 discloses a system with connector part 45, first rigid component 41 and flexible (second) component 40. The second component 40 does not have bolt holes or inserts. Daoud at 30 and Waskiewicz at 76, 74 disclose such features. Obvious to use these features in Inoue in place of securement means 40f, 40b. This would enable strong securement to the panel and the inserts would protect the flange material from damage.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue alone or in view of Nieman.

The Inoue apparatus 40 <sup>secured</sup> ~~secured~~ inwardly to 41 and outwardly to panel 3. It seems obvious that part 40 would be insulative since it appears to be a plastic molded part. Should this be at issue, obvious to form 40 of plastic in view of Nieman at 29 for lower cost than of metal.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: <sup>with respect to Daoud</sup> Claims 1, 18 are seen to define patentably over Daoud alone since his flexible apparatus 20 is for mounting a "cable"

Art Unit: 2839

not a "connector part". A cable cannot properly be read as a "connector part" since these terms have distinct meanings in the art.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone number 308-1729.

Abrams/ek

09/03/03

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322